REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated August 25, 2004, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on November 25, 2004. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

In the specification, the paragraphs 3, 9, 13, and 35 have been amended to correct minor editorial problems.

Claims 1-27 are pending in the application. Claims 1-27 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 1, 2, 12, 16 and 17, have been amended. Applicants submit that neither the amendments to the claims nor the specification introduce any new matter into the Application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 12-14, 16, 18-20, and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Veditz et al.* ("*Veditz*"), U.S. Patent No. 6,496,793.

Regarding claims 1, 12, and 16, the examiner asserts that *Veditz* teaches the claimed invention of determining character sets for client-server communications. Noticeably, however, the terms "client", "server", "internet", or even "network" appear nowhere within the text of *Veditz*. By its own terms, *Veditz* discloses a system configured to "intelligently process data objects created or modified under one language driver with those created or modified by a different language driver." *Veditz*, Abstract. The system disclosed by Veditz

> continually checks and maintains correct language configuration. A descriptor or Language Driver Identifier (LDID) (e.g., in the form of a system-comparable unit) is employed for storing in desired location(s) of a data object information specifying the langue driver that was in use when the data object was created or modified.

Veditz, 3:23-28. This process of maintaining a correct language configuration enables the system of *Veditz* to determine when the system is inappropriately configured for a data object about to be processed. *Veditz*, 7:45-50. Each data object in the system may be tagged with an LDID, and the system itself maintains an "active" LDID (i.e., the

314898_1

LDID presently being used by the system). *Veditz,* 14:56-62. The active LDID, in turn, is written to data objects which the system "touches" (i.e., creates or modifies). *Veditz,* 14:63-64.

Thus, a software application operating in the system of *Veditz* leaves a remnant of itself in each data object that is available on the system accessed by a software application. And the system of *Veditz* operates at the global level of the system, impacting the operation of any application used to access a data object available on the system. Further, the system itself is a standalone computer and there is no indication in *Veditz* of any network communications of any kind.

Applicants, in contrast, claim a method for determining the most appropriate character set for an HTTP server to use in response to an HTTP request made by an HTTP client (i.e., a web-browser application) as part of network communications. Specifically, applicants claim "selecting a character set for an HTTP client request made by the HTTP client to an HTTP server, the selecting comprising: determining whether the HTTP client request includes a request character set designation." The Examiner argues that this element is disclosed in *Veditz* at Figure 3A, reference No. 303. The method 300 illustrated in Figure 3, however, illustrates a method of file operation on a standalone system to open a file. The specific step 303 determines whether the file being opened includes an LDID. The text accompanying this figure describes an example of opening a database file:

> at step 303 the language driver identifier (LDID) in the data file is read. In a preferred embodiment, the identifier will be stored in the data file at a position where it may be conveniently accessed upon first reading the file. The identifier may be stored, for instance, within a header of the data file.

Veditz, 16:56-59. As this quote makes clear, the system disclosed by *Veditz* operates in conjunction with file operations. Applicants, however, claim selecting a character set for a network transaction between an HTTP client and an HTTP server. Because the system of *Veditz* fails to disclose determining character sets for client-server communications that include selecting a character set for an HTTP client request made by the HTTP client to an HTTP server, *Veditz* fails to teach, show, or suggest the invention claimed by Applicants.

314898_1

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims, 6, 10, 11, 21, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Veditz* in view of *Hom et al.* (hereinafter *"Hom"*), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/01 56688. Claims 15 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Veditz* in view of *Kan et al.* (hereinafter *"Kan"*), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0088544. Each of these claims depends from independent claims 1, 12, or 16. Because Applicants believe that the rejection of these claims is traversed by the above remarks, each claim depending from one of the independent claims should be allowable. Accordingly, applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

The secondary references made of record are noted. Applicants' believe, however, that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicants' disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Applicants believe, therefore that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this office action.

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

Gero G. McClellan
Registration No. 44,227
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants

Page 11

314898_1